

78-3007

Executive Registry

78-9802

31 JUL 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

FROM : F. W. M. Jamney
Director of Personnel

SUBJECT : Allocation of Supergrade Ceiling Allowances to
the Career Services

1. Action Requested: Approval of recommendation.

2. Background: The Career Services have recently been instructed to prepare promotion plans under the new guidelines of the uniform promotion system. One major cause of uncertainty in their planning is the requirement to establish supergrade promotion targets without an advance determination of what their supergrade ceiling allowances are or will be.

The Heads of Career Service know the total number of established supergrade positions they have and on a monthly basis are informed by OP of their portion of these positions that are "fillable" as a ratio of the Agency's authorized supergrade ceiling as approved by OMB--which is fewer than the number of adjudicated supergrade positions on the tables of organization.

Under current Agency policy, however, the Career Services are not formally allocated a portion of the Agency's supergrade ceiling allowances. Supergrade promotions are approved by the Director and are controlled in the context of the Agency at-large ceiling.

The Career Services, however, are now required to plan for specific numbers of supergrade promotions within their fiscal year promotion plan, but have no basis to anticipate how many promotions they can expect to be approved. This introduces uncertainty into the successor progression associated with the flow of supergrade promotions.

(EXECUTIVE REGISTRY FILE

P-1.16

SECRET

3. Staff Position: There are alternative means of establishing the basis or starting point for the allocation of supergrade ceiling allowances to the Career Services.

(a) The first alternative would be based on the current position "accounting" methodology and involves the principle of providing each Career Service an equal percentage of the number of "fillable" supergrade positions on its own tables of organization. The percentage would be determined by the rates of supergrade ceiling in the Agency to the current number of supergrade positions currently on the books (i.e.)

Under this method the total number of established supergrade positions would not be reduced and the number of "fillable" supergrade positions would be automatically adjusted as new supergrade positions were added or positions were eliminated or reduced below supergrade level.

The Heads of Career Service could establish the relative priorities as to which of their supergrade positions would be encumbered by supergrades at any point in time. This alternative would provide the Heads of Career Service with an allowance for which they would be accountable; they could establish their annual supergrade incumbency and promotion targets, and could develop their promotion recommendations to the DCI within the limits of the headroom available to their own Career Service.

(b) The second option involves the principle of proportionate strength. It would establish the supergrade allowance in each Career Service proportionate to total strength. This approach would depart from the hierarchical, substantive and programmatic basis on which current established supergrade positions have and should have been classified and justified. It would result in serious reductions of allowances in the DCI area, the DDO and NFAC with increases in the DDA and DESGT.

(c) A third option would involve the establishment of a modest DCI "reserve" of supergrade allowances to permit DCI allocations for future contingency requirements with the remaining supergrade allowances allocated to the five Career Services on the basis of the methodology outlined in option (a) (i.e., without eliminating any properly classified and established supergrade positions).

SECRET

(d) A fourth option would involve the establishment of a DCI "reserve" of supergrade allowances and distribution of the remaining allowances to the five Career Services on the basis of option (a) methodology. Once allocations are made known, the number of supergrade positions on the tables of organization would be reduced to the approved supergrade ceiling. These excess positions (which would be retained at the grade GS-15 level) would be identified by the Heads of Career Service and approved for reduction by the DCI. As relative priorities changed, the Heads of Career Service could transfer supergrade status among positions previously adjudicated at the supergrade level or to new positions. In no case, however, could the number of established supergrade positions exceed the Career Service allocation.

Both (b) and (d) approaches, while simplifying accounting, would present a potential problem in defending externally the Agency's authorized supergrade ceiling. Historically, the Agency has had a strong argument in previous issues with GMB in defending our supergrade ceiling by being able to show that the actual number of classified supergrade positions representative of organizational and programmatic requirements exceeded the lower number of supergrade ceiling allotted by GMB to the Agency.

(e) The table attached displays the supergrades arrayed according to current positions and on-duty strength and the allocations which would result from alternatives (a), (b), (c), and (d).

(f) The alternatives (a) and (c) above would provide a basis for supergrade allocations to the Directorates and would adhere to the current Agency policy of retaining all positions classified at the supergrade level on the tables of organization but limiting encumbrances to the GMB approved supergrade ceiling. Both options (a) and (b), however, would result in a disbursement of the total Agency supergrade ceiling to the five Career Services. Options (c) and (d) would institute a partial disbursement of the Agency supergrade ceiling to the Career Services but would offer the advantage of a non-distributed portion of the supergrade ceiling held in a "reserve" for use by the DCI in meeting new requirements or other contingencies without forcing redistribution of the Career Services allowances.

Option (b), based upon a simple statistical relationship to the size of the Career Service would result in a disbursement of supergrade ceiling totally disproportionate to requirements for coverage.

SECRET

SECRET

Approved For Release 2005/08/15 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000200070012-4

4. Recommendations:

(a) It is recommended that the proposals contained in option (c) be adopted.

(b) That the DCI promulgate a supergrade position ceiling allocation in advance of each fiscal year, making adjustments as may be required after budget reviews and endeavoring to maintain such continuity in supergrade allocation as would support promotion planning within the Career Services.

[Redacted Signature Box]

F. W. M. Janney

25X1

Attachment

APPROVED :

Mark Carlson
Deputy Director of Central Intelligence
Review of 5 is fine.

4 AUG 1979

Date

DISAPPROVED:

Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

Date

Distribution:

Orig. - DDCI (To be returned to D/Pers)

1 - DDCI

1 - ER

2 - DDA

2 - D/Pers

1 - OP/P&C

*Let's tell them they have
to get down to allocation
by end of FY 79-80*

Approved For Release 2005/08/15 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000200070012-4